

second ceramic substrate provided with the opening and having a second thickness larger than the first thickness, the second ceramic substrate being laminated on the first ceramic substrate, and an edge portion of the opening and a periphery of the opening being metallized] a base having the opening formed therein, the piezoelectric resonator element being fixed to the base, and the opening being formed at a position of the base opposite to one of the resonator arms of the piezo-electric resonator element.

### REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-22 and 30-37 are pending. By this amendment, claim 8 is amended for clarity. In particular, claim 8 is amended to clarify that the piezoelectric resonator element is fixed to the base of the housing, and an opening being formed at a position of the base opposite to one of the resonator arms of the piezo-electric resonator element, as shown in Fig. 3 and as discussed on page 8, line 26 to page 9, line 10 of the application, for example. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendment to claim 8 is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance, for all the reasons discussed herein; and (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search for consideration. Furthermore, as discussed above, the amendment is merely for clarity.

The Office Action objects to the July 17 Amendment under 35 U.S.C. §132 as introducing new matter. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the July 17 amendment is merely for clarity, as requested by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. These features are at least shown in originally filed Figs. 1(b) and 11. That is, at least Figs. 1(b) and 11, as originally filed, show a first ceramic substrate having a first thickness, and a second ceramic substrate provided with an opening and having a second thickness larger than the first thickness.